

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are pending in this application. Claims 16 and 25 stand object to because of informalities. Claims 1, 2, 20 and 26 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by InterGis. Claims 10, 18, 19, 23, 24, 25, 27 and 28 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by Morlok. Claims 3 and 22 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over InterGis in view of Janovski. Claims 4-8, 14 and 21 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over InterGis in view of Pulliam. Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over InterGis in view of Morlok. Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morlok in view of Pulliam. Claims 12, 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morlik in view of InterGis. Claims 13 and 17 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morlik in view of InterGis and further in view of Pulliam.

Claim 16 has been amended to correct the informality identified by the Examiner by changing "purchasers" to "purchaser".

The applicants request reconsideration of the objection to claim 25. The phrase "at least one of the products" is used at page 16, line 7-8 (lines 6-7 of the claim) to designate a subset of the plurality of products. The Examiner questions the second reference to that subset, which occurs at page 16, lines 11-12 (lines 10-11 of the claim). Since there is antecedent basis for the phrase "at lease one of the products", it is proper to state "the at least one of the products." Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claim 25 is requested.

With regard to the prior art rejections based upon the InterGis reference, the applicants note that priority is taken in the present application to a provisional application 60/190,680 filed on March 20, 2000, which predates the November 13, 2000 publication date of the InterGis reference. The provisional application contains disclosure that supports claims 1-9, 12-17, 20-22 & 26 of the present patent application and that anticipates those portions of InterGis that are relied upon by the Examiner to support the rejection of claims 1-9, 12-17, 20-22 & 26. The Examiner's attention is drawn to page 1,

paragraph 1) of the provisional application specification, for example, and further to pages 3 and 4 of the provisional application specification. Accordingly, InterGis is not prior art as to those portions of the above-noted claims, and all rejections under 35 USC 102 and 103 that rely upon InterGis should be withdrawn.

With regard to the prior art rejections based upon the Morlok reference, the applicants note that priority is taken in the present application to a provisional application 60/190,680 filed on March 20, 2000, which predates the June 15, 2000 publication date of the Morlok reference. The provisional application contains disclosure that supports claims 9-13, 15-19, 23-25, 27 and 28 and that anticipates those portions of Morlok that are relied upon by the Examiner to support the rejection of claims 9-13, 15-19, 23-25, 27 and 28. The Examiner's attention is drawn to page 1, paragraph 1) of the provisional application specification, for example, and further to pages 3 and 4 of the provisional application specification. Accordingly, Morlok is not prior art as to those portions of the above-noted claims, and all rejections under 35 USC 102 and 103 that rely upon Morlok should be withdrawn.

Upon removal of InterGis and Morlok as prior art references, all pending claims stand in condition for allowance. New claims 29-32 are added herein. Reconsideration of the application and allowance of claims 1-32 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



David G. Maire
Reg. No. 34,865
Beusse Brownlee Wolter Mora & Maire, P.A.
390 North Orange Avenue
Suite 2500
Orlando, FL 32801
telephone: 407-926-7704
facsimile: 407-926-7720